REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of the claim for priority and all certified copies of priority documents.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge acceptance of the drawings.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected. Claims 3 and 4 are cancelled. Claims 9-12 are newly added.

New dependent claims 9-12 are added to at least partially restore the original range of claims that existed before multiple dependencies were removed in the preliminary amendment. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. (US 5,583,679) (herein 'Ito') in view of Conner et al. (US 5,548,422) (herein 'Conner') and Scheffer (US 4,239,349).

Ito discloses a liquid crystal display with optical compensation. In the embodiment of Figs. 6 and 7, a single optical compensatory sheet has an orientation such that the projection of the direction of minimum retardation 62M in the x-y plane forms an angle α of 90 to 270 degrees with the rubbing direction 61Ra (Fig. 7).

In view of this teaching, Applicant's claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 3, and claim 3 is cancelled. Thus, claim 1 now calls for the angle φ to have a value $0° < \phi \leq 15°$.

The Examiner states that if the rubbing direction 61B of Ito is taken as the active rubbing direction, then the range of 90-270 degrees for α encompasses Applicant's range of $0° < \phi \leq 15°$

for ϕ in the case where α is between 255 and 270 degrees.

However, Ito teaches that the angle α is between the direction 62M of the sheet 62 and direction 61Ra on the upper side of LC cell 61. Col. 21, line 38. Thus, Ito makes clear that that the angle α is defined by direction 62M and by the rubbing direction on the same side as sheet 62.

In order to make clear which is the active rubbing direction, Applicant has amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 4, and claim 4 has been cancelled. Thus, claim 1 makes clear that the element is present on that side of the liquid crystalline material where said material has its active rubbing direction.

The Examiner has argued that claim 4 is unpatentable because either direction can be taken as the active rubbing direction. However, claim 1 requires that the active rubbing direction be on that side where the element is present.

Thus, both Ito and Applicant call for an angle formed by the compensating element and the adjacent rubbing direction in the LC cell. However, Ito's angle falls within the range of 90-270 degrees, while Applicant's angle falls within the range of $0° < \phi \leq 15°$.

Thus, Applicant's amended claims clear distinguish patentably with respect to the teachings of Ito. With respect to Conner and Scheffer, both have been cited to show the use of LC cells in a display system. However, neither Conner nor Scheffer teaches anything with respect to the specific limitations claimed by Applicant with respect to the LC cell and its associated compensation element.

In view of the above arguments and amendments, it is urged that the rejection is in error, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
203-329-6584